

REMARKS

In the outstanding Final Official Action, the amendments to the disclosure submitted in the Response filed on June 7, 2006 were objected-to as introducing new matter into the present application. Claims 57 and 59 were objected-to as being substantially duplicative of claim 38. Claims 38-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 38-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 38, 45, 56-69 and 61-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over PATTERSON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 384,068). Claim 60 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over PATTERSON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 384,068).

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy in conducting a personal interview with an inventor of the present application, Gus Nathan, and Applicants' representative, Joshua M. Povsner, on July 31, 2006. In the personal interview, the invention to which the claims of the present application are directed was discussed in comparison to documents applied during the prosecution of the present application.

Upon entry of the present amendment, Applicants will have amended the two paragraphs added to the written description of the specification in the Response filed on June 7, 2006. The added paragraphs will have been amended to eliminate those portions objected-to in the Final Official Action. In view of the herein-contained amendments to the specification, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the amendments to the disclosure submitted on June 7, 2006.

Claim 57 and 60 will have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the

subject matter recited therein. Claim 59 will have been amended to ensure consistency with the specification and drawings as filed and to incorporate substantially all of the features previously recited in claim 60. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 57 and 59.

Claim 38 will have been amended to eliminate language relating to an internal periphery and external periphery. As noted above, claim 59 will have been amended to ensure consistency with the specification and drawings as filed. Additionally, claims 70 and 71 will have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38-71 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

As noted above, claim 38 will have been amended to eliminate language relating to an internal periphery and external periphery. Additionally, claims 61-64 will have been amended to recite features of the "cup" rather than a "cup-shaped body", so as to avoid confusion. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38-71 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicants will also have amended claim 38 to recite "said chamber being substantially free of fluid flow obstructions extending in a direction transverse to the jet fluid flow in a region between said second fluid inlet and said first fluid inlet". Applicants submit that such a feature is not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by PATTERSON. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 38, as well as each of the remaining claims which depends, directly or indirectly, from amended claim 38.

Applicants also note that dependent claims 39-44 and 47-55 were not rejected

over any document properly considered as prior art. Accordingly, claims 39 and 47 have been amended into independent form to include substantially all of the features recited in previous claim 38 except for those features relating to an internal periphery and external periphery. Applicants particularly note that claim 47 has not been amended to include features of claims 45 and/or 46, from each of which claim 47 previously depended. Nevertheless, Applicants submit that PATTERSON does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in amended independent claim 47. Claims 40-44 depend, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim 39, and claims 48-55 depend, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim 47. Accordingly, Applicants submit that each of claims 39-44 and 47-55 is now in condition for allowance.

At least for each and all of the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 38, 39 and 47 are allowable. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 40-46, 48-56, 58-59 and 61-69 are allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional reasons related to their own recitations.


SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so. Applicants have amended the claims and explained specific features of the claimed combination which are not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the references applied in the outstanding Final Official Action.

The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any comments regarding this Response of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard M. KELSO et al.


Joshua M. Povsner
Reg. #42,086
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

November 17, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191